

Andrew Jackson to Henry Daniel, June 25, 1827, from Correspondence of Andrew Jackson. Edited by John Spencer Bassett.

TO HENRY DANIEL.¹

¹ Handwriting of John H. Eaton. Daniel lived at Mount Sterling, Ky.

Hermitage, June 25, 1827.

D'r Sir, Your letter of the 9 Inst has been recvd, in which you ask of me some explanation relative to the duty imposed in 1824 on Cotton Bagging. I have a thorough recollection of the circumstances of that Bill, and particularly of the proceedings which took place as to the article of Bagging.

When the Bill came to the Senate from the House of Rep my attention was directed principally towards those items which I considered essential and necessary to our prosperity in times of war, where of Hemp, and articles made of Hemp stood prominently. Duck was necessary in war as constituting a material article in the preparation of our ships. With a view to an uniform and equal operation of the Tarriff in different sections of our Country it seemed proper that a relative and corresponding duty should be placed on all and every article of which Hemp was the material part: and this object appeared to have been regarded by the Ho of Rep, looking to the shape in which the Bill came to the Senate.

An increased duty tho on Russian and Holland Duck going to affect the shipping interest of N England was objected to; the amount at which it had been placed by the House of Rep was stricken out, and the *ad valorem* duty reduced to 15 p cent. Acting with a view to uniform justice between the No and South, I could not discern the propriety of placing

Library of Congress

Ducks needful to our merchant ships at a low rate of duty, and Bagging made of the same material at a more advanced duty. You will accordingly find that on the first application to reduce the $4\frac{1}{2}$ Cents duty on Bagging I voted against it; and did likewise vote against reducing Russian and Holland ducks to the ad valorem duty of 15 pr Cent. (See Senate Journal 1823–24, pages 361n–368). The motion to reduce however succeeded, after which time I deemed it right and so voted to make a correspondent reduction on Bagging. The two Houses remained divided between $4\frac{1}{2}$ and $3\frac{1}{2}$: this in the end was settled by a committee of conference at 3 and $\frac{3}{4}$ to which I agreed and for which sum I voted, and likewise for the entire Bill on its final passage.

Another consideration operated! The Ho of Rep had placed the duty on Hemp at 2 Cents a pound. This the Senate had stricken out and reduced contrary to my vote and wishes to I think \$35 a ton, making about 25 per Cent deduction. Uniformity being essential and right, it seemed to be quite proper, that as the raw material was reduced, so likewise should there be a correspondent reduction on the manufactured material.

These concisely are the considerations and reasons which operated with me on that part of the tarriff of 1824 about which you have solicited my views and opinions. wishing you health and happiness I am very respectful[l]y yo mo obt